

Application No.: 09/727,908
Amendment dated: June 28, 2006
Reply to Office Action of: April 28, 2006

REMARKS

By this amendment and remarks, claims 1, 9 and 15 have been amended. Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. In view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks urged here, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0131404 to Mehta et al. (“Mehta”).

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 9 and 15 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to recite “previously installed software” and the step of preventing a user from accessing web clipping applications that are previously installed on” the electronic device. Similarly, claim 9 has been amended to recite that the step of registering the PID, and commanding “by said proxy server to” the PID to reveal the web clipping applications. Similarly, claim 15 has been amended to recite that the memory has “previously installed software for accessing said proxy server” and the step of “preventing a user from accessing previously installed web clipping applications that are installed” on the electronic device.

The present invention, as recited in independent claims 1, 9 and 15, is directed to authenticating and activating web clipping applications. One of the problems associated with web clipping applications on portable electronic devices is the need for authenticating access to a proxy server while minimizing expensive data transmission which can be costly. Therefore, the present invention proposes loading multiple hidden web clipping applications on the portable electronic device and after registering the portable electronic device with the proxy server, a command from the proxy server reveals the hidden web clipping applications,

The Examiner’s cited reference, Mehta, is fundamentally different. Mehta is directed to a mobile application system (MAS) which provides applications to registered subscribers of the MAS. Importantly, the applications are not previously installed on the mobile electronic devices

Application No.: 09/727,908
Amendment dated: June 28, 2006
Reply to Office Action of: April 28, 2006

prior to registration or authentication. Mehta teaches that the applications are downloaded to the mobile electronic device after a user has registered or authenticated himself to the MAS.

Since Mehta does not disclose each and every element of claims 1, 9 and 15, the claims are allowable over Mehta. Claims 2-8, 10-14 and 16-20, by their dependency on claims 1, 9 and 15 respectively, are similarly allowable. Early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections, and that they be withdrawn. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative if an interview might expedite allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

BERRY & ASSOCIATES P.C.



Dated: June 28, 2006

By: _____
Bosco Kim
Registration No. 41,896

Berry & Associates P.C.
9255 Sunset Boulevard
Suite 810
Los Angeles, CA 90069
(310) 247-2860